

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/567,693	02/07/2006	Hendrik Anton Van Esveld	NL 030973	3942	
	HILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS O. BOX 3001 WILLIAMS, JOSEPH L				
P.O. BOX 3001					
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2879		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS 04/19/2007		04/19/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·		•	TH
*		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/567,693	VAN ESVELD ET AL.
Office Act	ion Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Joseph L. Williams	2879
The MAILING E Period for Reply	ATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
WHICHEVER IS LON - Extensions of time may be a after SIX (6) MONTHS from - If NO period for reply is spec - Failure to reply within the se	GER, FROM THE MAILING D. vailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 the mailing date of this communication. ified above, the maximum statutory period to rextended period for reply will, by statute fice later than three months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON' e, cause the application to become AB	pply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1) Responsive to o	communication(s) filed on 07 F	ebruary 2006.	
2a) This action is FI		action is non-final.	
	cation is in condition for allowald ance with the practice under E	*	ers, prosecution as to the merits is . 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims			
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s)6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is	/are rejected.		
	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	
Application Papers	,		
10) The drawing(s) f Applicant may no Replacement draw	• • •	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ c drawing(s) be held in abeyan tion is required if the drawing(
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Sor 1. ☑ Certified c 2. ☐ Certified c 3. ☐ Copies of applicatio	copies of the priority document copies of the priority document	s have been received. s have been received in Aprity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cite		4) ☐ Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)
	Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date formal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pollard (US 3,916,241).

Regarding claim 1, Pollard ('241) teaches in figures 1 and 2 and the corresponding text a high-pressure discharge lamp comprising: a discharge vessel (1) enclosing a discharge space (no number) which contains an ionizable filling, the discharge vessel (1) having a first (2) and a second (2) mutually opposed neck-shaped portion (no number) provided with a pair of electrodes (3) arranged in the discharge space (no number), each electrode (3) being tubular over its entire length.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,693

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 2, Pollard ('241) teaches characterized in that the electrodes are free from coils in the discharge space.

Regarding claim 6, Pollard ('241) teaches that the ratio between the inner diameter d_{in} and the outer diameter d_{out} of the electrodes (3) is in the range:

$$0.2 <= d_{in}/d_{out} <= 0.8$$

Regarding claim 7, Pollard ('241) teaches that the inner diameter of the tubular electrodes is at least 20 micrometers.

Regarding claim 9, Pollard ('241) teaches that the electrodes are made of tungsten.

Regarding claim 10, the amount of current is directed towards the operation of the lamp and is thus not germane to the structure. Thus, the amount of current limitation has not been afforded patentable weight.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holle et al. (US 4,202,999).

Regarding claim 1, Holle ('999) teaches in figure 1 and the corresponding text a high-pressure discharge lamp (1) comprising: a discharge vessel (2) enclosing a discharge space (no number) which contains an ionizable filling, the discharge vessel

(1) having a first and a second (4) mutually opposed neck-shaped portion provided with a pair of electrodes (3) arranged in the discharge space (no number), each electrode (3) being tubular over its entire length.

Regarding claim 2, Holle ('999) teaches that the electrodes are free from coils in the discharge space.

Regarding claim 3, Holle ('999) teaches that the electrodes extend to outside the discharge vessels.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollard (US 3,916,241) in view of White (US 3,558,964).

Regarding claim 3, Pollard ('241) teaches all of the claimed inventions except for the electrodes extending outside of the discharge vessel.

Further regarding claim 3, White ('964) teaches in figure 1 a high-pressure discharge lamp comprised of, in part, the electrodes extending outside of the discharge vessel for the purpose of providing added support for the electrodes.

Page 5

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the extending electrodes of White in the lamp of Pollard for the purpose of providing added support for the electrodes.

Regarding claim 4, Pollard ('241) teaches that the electrodes are each partially filled with a rod (4) welded to a side of the electrodes facing away from the discharge space.

Regarding claim 5, Pollard ('241) teaches the rod extends into the discharge space.

Regarding claim 8, Pollard teaches all of the claimed limitations except for the claimed ratio between the electrodes and the neck portion.

Further regarding claim 8, White ('964) teaches in column 3, line 52+ that the ratio of the outer diameter d_{out} of the tubular electrodes and the inner diameter d_{nsp} of the neck-shaped portions is in the range:

$$0.8 <= d_{out}/d_{nsp} <= 0.95$$

for the purpose of improving the stability of the electrode.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the electrode and neck portion ratio of White in the lamp of Pollard for the purpose of improving the stability of the electrode.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph L. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-2465. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph L. Williams Primary Examiner Art Unit 2879 Page 6